

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/904,585 07/16/2001 Yehoshua Yeshurun YESHURUN=3A 3898 1444 7590 02/24/2006 EXAMINER BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA 624 NINTH STREET, NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303 1771

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/904,585	YESHURUN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ula C. Ruddock	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (136(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communications ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 N</u>	lovember 2005.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merit	s is
closed in accordance with the practice under I	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-33</u> is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-33</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •	• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	I Office Action or form PTO-152	2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	•	received in this National Stage)
application from the International Burea	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 09/904,585 Page 2

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 30, 2005, has been entered.
- 2. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's amendment and accompanying remarks filed November 30, 2005. The rejections have been maintained.
- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

4. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed November 30, 2005, is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 14-33 based upon Blommer et al. and Fischer et al. as set forth in the last Office action because: the showing is not commensurate in scope with the claims. It appears as though Applicant's main argument is that Fischer does not teach a first ply of PMMA in an orientation different to that of the subsequent plies. However, Applicant's claims, as presently written, do not specify that <u>only</u> the first layer be in a different orientation when compared to the remaining layers.

Art Unit: 1771

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 14-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blommer et al. (US 4,989,493) in view of Fischer et al. (US 4,594,290). Blommer et al. disclose a structure for attenuating explosive shock waves to prevent propagation of accidental explosions (abstract). The structure comprises a center sheet of steel surrounded by aluminum, poly methyl methacrylate (PMMA) acrylic plastic, and a rigid foam made from a 50/50 mixture of glass microballoons and a polyurethane resin (col 3, ln 34-40). It should be noted that the Examiner is equating Blommer's aluminum layer to Applicant's rear layer (as shown on page 5 of 6 of present specification) and Blommer's glass microballoons to the glass brittle covering in Applicant's invention. Blommer et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the teaching that the armor layer is slanted oriented relative to the expected trajectory of the oncoming projectile.

Fischer et al. disclose an impact resistant laminate that includes a first ply, which is disposed in the direction of an expected impact (col 1, ln 62-64). The first ply can comprise glass or polymethyl methacrylate (col 2, ln 19-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used Fischer's teaching of disposing the front ply in the direction of an expected impact on the structure of Blommer et al., motivated by the desire to create an explosion-attenuating device that has increased explosion attenuation.

With regard to claims 24 and 25, it would have been obvious to make the armor layer transparent or opaque, motivated by the desire to create a laminate having a desired aesthetic appearance.

Art Unit: 1771

With regard to claims 32 and 33, although the combination of Blommer et al. and Fischer et al. fail to specifically disclose "plates", it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have made the poly methyl methacrylate (PMMA) acrylic plastic into a plate, motivated by the desire to create a device having increased explosion attenuation. Furthermore, the front surface of Blommer et al. and Fischer et al. is coextensive with the armor layer.

In addition, the combination of Blommer et al. and Fischer et al. would protect a body from oncoming regular firearm projectiles.

Rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed November 30, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth. Applicant argues that Fischer does not teach that their front layer is slantingly oriented and that their first ply of PMMA is in an orientation different to that of the subsequent plies. This argument is not persuasive because Fischer specifically states that the <u>first</u> ply is disposed in direction of an expected impact. Fischer never states that the additional layers are disposed in a direction too. Furthermore, the claims do not require that only the first layer be in a different orientation when compared to the remaining layers. Applicant also argues that the combination of Blommer and Fischer does not teach the presently claimed invention. This argument is not persuasive because the Examiner is using Fischer's teaching of disposing the first ply in the direction of an expected impact on the structure of Blommer. Therefore, only the first (i.e. front) layer of Blommer would be disposed in the direction of an expected impact. Applicant also

Application/Control Number: 09/904,585

Art Unit: 1771

argues that the Blommer reference contains additional layers, which are not present in the claimed

invention. This argument is not persuasive because the claims are written in open language, which

do not preclude the use of additional layers. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Ula C. Ruddock whose telephone number is 571-272-1481. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may

be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UCR WUN

Ua Ruddock
Primary Examiner

Page 5

Tech Center 1700